

# School Accountability Report Card Reported for School Year 2009-10 Published During 2010-11

## Rose Drive Elementary School

4700 Rose Drive  
Yorba Linda, CA 92886  
714-528-4830

### School Overview

**Grades:** K-5  
**Enrollment:** 371  
**School Mascot:** Roadrunner  
**School Colors:** Red and White

The School Accountability Report Card (SARC), which is required by law to be published annually, contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. More information about SARC requirements is available on the California Department of Education (CDE) [SARC](#) Web page. For additional information about the school, parents and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

## I. Data and Access

### DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district, the county, and the state. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., Academic Performance Index [API], Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP]), test data, enrollment, graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners).

### Internet Access

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible (e.g., the California State Library). Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

## II. About This School

### Contact Information (School Year 2010-11)

This section provides the schools contact information.

School		District	
School Name	Rose Drive Elementary	District Name	Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified
Street	4700 Rose Dr.	Phone Number	714-996-2550
City, State, Zip	Yorba Linda , CA 92886-2096	Web Site	<a href="http://www.pylusd.org">www.pylusd.org</a>
Phone Number	714-986-7250	Superintendent	Dennis Smith
Principal	Liana Neuland	E-mail Address	<a href="mailto:dsmith@pylusd.org">dsmith@pylusd.org</a>

E-mail Address	lneuland@pylusd.org	CDS Code	30- 66647- 6030951
----------------	---------------------	----------	--------------------

## School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2009-10)

**Grades: K-5**

**School Mascot: Rosie the Roadrunner**

**School Colors: Red & White**

Rose Drive is located in Yorba Linda, CA. Rose Drive has an enrollment of 371 students in K-5. There are 12 general education classes and 3 Preschool Intervention Classrooms. Approximately 4% of our students are English Language Learners. The vast majority of students come from single-family homes. Students are provided a comprehensive curriculum, which includes reading, language arts, mathematics, history/social science, science, visual and performing arts, physical education and health. A computer lab provides weekly instructions to all students in grades K-5 and a library/media center provides additional educational opportunities. All students are placed in a Response to Intervention (RtI) program which provides them with reading extensions/interventions based on their reading ability. There are 12 regular education teachers, 3 Speech & Language Preschool Intervention Teachers, 1 Resource Specialist, 1 principal, 1 secretary and 1 clerk. We also have 1 part-time health clerk, 2 custodians, 2 media clerks, 1 Speech & Language therapist, 1 psychologist, 1 ELD aide, 5 special education aides and 5 noon supervisors. Childcare is available before and after school.

**School Mission:** The mission of Rose Drive Elementary is to teach all students the knowledge and skills necessary for effective communication, calculation, reasoning, and social interactions with the ultimate goal of enabling them to live responsible lives and successfully meet the challenge of the future. The school's role is to lay the foundation for future success at succeeding levels of education. It is to foster the development of self-esteem and responsibility, while instilling the thirst for learning and excellence.

## Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2009-10)

We know it takes encouragement and support from parents for our children to be able to achieve the goals and expectations we set before them. The parents of Rose Drive students, without a doubt, encourage and support our students and are partners in all aspects of their child's education. Rose Drive has an extremely active PTA that prides itself on strengthening and supporting school programs. PTA leadership is key in recruiting volunteers to coordinate a variety of opportunities for community members to become involved. These opportunities include our school Art Docent Program, Reflections Contest, Yearbook, Labels and Boxtops for Education. School Site Council, Red Ribbon Week, Assemblies, Book Fairs, Jog-A-Thon and Business Partnerships are other areas that we use parent volunteers. Computer Lab, Library, District Parent Advisory Council, Safety Committee, Valet help and classroom volunteers are more ways for parents to help out at Rose Drive

**Kelly Krahling – PTA President (714) 986-7250**

## Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

This table displays by grade level the average class size and the number of classrooms that fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom).

Grade Level	2007-08			2008-09			2009-10					
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
K	11.5	2			16.0	4			15.0		4	**
1	18.5	2			19.3	3			29.2	**	2.5	**
2	19.7	3			20.0	2			30.0	**	2	**
3	31.0		2		31.5		2		28.0	**	2	**
4	29.5		2		34.0			2	27.2	**	**	2.5
5	31.0		2		29.5		2		37.3	**	**	1.5
6									**	**	**	**
K-3	18.0	1			21.0		1		**	**	**	**
3-4									**	**	**	**
4-8									**	**	**	**
Other									**	**	**	**

\*\*The data in this table are not available to the CDE due to delays in receiving CBEDS information. Therefore, these data must be provided by the LEA.

### III. School Climate

#### School Safety Plan (School Year 2009-10)

School Safety Plan: Date of Last Review: September, 2009

Rose Drive makes every effort to provide a safe and orderly environment for staff and students. The Safety Committee meets on a regular basis to review/revise our school plan and to address issues that are brought to their attention to assure that everyone is informed of all safety procedures. Office procedures are in place to monitor access to the campus and to assure safe practices are used in response to health issues. Practice drills are scheduled throughout the year to prepare students and staff for emergencies. The PTA assists with preparations for emergencies, and parents are active participants on our school Safety Committee.

#### Suspensions and Expulsions

This table displays the rate of suspensions and expulsions (the total number of incidents divided by the total enrollment) at the school and district levels for the most recent three-year period.

Rate	School			District		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Suspensions	0.0	0.3	0	7.0	6.5	0.06
Expulsions	0.0	0.0	0	0.1	0.1	0.0012

\*\*The data in this table are not available to the CDE due to delays in receiving CBEDS information. Therefore, these data must be provided by the LEA.

## IV. School Facilities

### School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (School Year 2010-11)

A new walkway to Rooms 21 and 22 is scheduled to be completed by Jan. 2011. Plans are being drawn for a lunch table shelter and improvements to the Multi-Purpose Room.

**Narrative to be provided by LEA**

### School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2010-11)

This table displays the results of the most recently completed school site inspection to determine the school facility's good repair status.

System Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	n/a	X			
<b>Interior:</b> Interior Surfaces	n/a	X			
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/Vermin Infestation	n/a	X			
<b>Electrical:</b> Electrical	n/a	X			Repair lights/ballasts – work orders submitted and repairs made.
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/Fountains	n/a	X			
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	n/a	X			
<b>Structural:</b> Structural Damage, Roofs	n/a	X			
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences	n/a	X			
<b>Overall Rating</b>	X				n/a

Date of Inspection: November 1, 2010

## V. Teachers

### Teacher Credentials

This table displays the number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential, without a full credential, and those teaching outside of their subject area of competence. Detailed information about teacher qualifications can be found on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page.

Teachers	School			District
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2009-10
With Full Credential	17	15	12	1095
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	2

Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	LEA Provided	LEA Provided	LEA Provided	27
---	--------------	--------------	--------------	----

\*\*The data in this table are not available to the CDE due to delays in receiving CBEDS information. Therefore, these data must be provided by the LEA.

## Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

This table displays the number of teacher misassignments (teachers assigned without proper legal authorization) and the number of vacant teacher positions (not filled by a single designated teacher assigned to teach the entire course at the beginning of the school year or semester). Note: Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

Indicator	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	LEA Provided	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	LEA Provided	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	LEA Provided	0	0

## Core Academic Classes Taught by No Child Left Behind Compliant Teachers (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays the percent of classes in core academic subjects taught by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) compliant and non-NCLB compliant teachers in the school, in all schools in the district, in high-poverty schools in the district, and in low-poverty schools in the district. High poverty schools are defined as those schools with student participation of approximately 75 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low poverty schools are those with student participation of approximately 25 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program. More information on teacher qualifications required under NCLB can be found on the CDE [Improving Teacher and Principal Quality](#) Web page.

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by NCLB Compliant Teachers	Taught by Non-NCLB Compliant Teachers
This School	100%	0
All Schools in District	100%	0
High-Poverty Schools in District	100%	0
Low-Poverty Schools in District	100%	0

\*\*The data in this table are not available to the CDE due to delays in receiving CBEDS information. Therefore, these data must be provided by the LEA.

## VI. Support Staff

### Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays, in units of full-time equivalents (FTE), the number of academic counselors and other support staff who are assigned to the school and the average number of students per academic counselor. One FTE equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor		
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)		N/A
Psychologist		N/A

Social Worker		N/A
Nurse		N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	4.0	N/A
Resource Specialist (non-teaching)		N/A
Other		

## VII. Curriculum and Instructional Materials

### Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2010-11)

This table displays information about the quality, currency, and availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school, and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Core Curriculum Area	Quality, Currency, and Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials	Percent of Pupils Who Lack Their Own Assigned Textbooks and Instructional Materials
Reading/Language Arts	100 % LEA Provided	0% Who Lack Their own Books and Materials
Mathematics	100 % LEA Provided	0% Who Lack Their own Books and Materials
Science	100 % LEA Provided	0% Who Lack Their own Books and Materials
History-Social Science	100 % LEA Provided	0% Who Lack Their own Books and Materials
Foreign Language	100 % LEA Provided	0% Who Lack Their own Books and Materials
Health	100 % LEA Provided	0% Who Lack Their own Books and Materials
Visual and Performing Arts	100 % LEA Provided	0% Who Lack Their own Books and Materials
Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9-12)	100 % LEA Provided	0% Who Lack Their own Books and Materials

Board Approved: September 14, 2010

## VIII. School Finances

### Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2008-09)

This table displays a comparison of the school's per pupil expenditures from unrestricted (basic) sources with other schools in the district and throughout the state, and a comparison of the average teacher salary at the school site with average teacher salaries at the district and state levels. Detailed information regarding school expenditures can be found on the CDE [Current Expense of Education & Per-pupil Spending](#) Web page and teacher salaries can be found on the CDE [Certificated Salaries & Benefits](#) Web page.

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Supplemental / Restricted)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Basic / Unrestricted)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	\$8,485.93	\$3,042.85	\$5,443.09	LEA Provided
District	N/A	N/A	LEA Provided	\$76,336
Percent Difference – School Site and District	-1.41%	N/A	LEA Provided	LEA Provided
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,681	\$68,179
Percent Difference – School Site and State	-4.37%	N/A	LEA Provided	LEA Provided

## Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2009-10)

This section provides information about the programs and supplemental services that are available at the school and funded through either categorical or other sources.

The school district receives funds from the state which go to pay for staff salaries, school operations, facilities improvements, services for the school and district-wide programs such as music, health, physical education, and more. Each school also receives a School and Library Improvement budget. Site staff determines expenditures that are approved by the School Site Council comprised of teachers, parents, and the principal. These funds pay for the library media clerk and computer lab clerk as well as instructional equipment and supplies to support the school instructional program. PTA also gifts funds to the school to be used for a variety of programs beneficial to the children such as field trips, assemblies, technology resources and other instructional supplies.

## Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2008-09)

This table displays district salaries for teachers, principals, and superintendents, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size. The table also displays teacher and administrative salaries as a percent of a district's budget, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size based on the salary schedule. Detailed information regarding salaries may be found on the CDE [Certificated Salaries & Benefits](#) Web page.

Category	District Amount	State Average For Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$40,656	\$42,377
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$75,374	\$67,667
Highest Teacher Salary	\$94,560	\$87,102
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$112,689	\$108,894
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$118,770	\$113,713
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$136,788	\$124,531
Superintendent Salary	\$241,680	\$223,323
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	43.80 %	40.20 %
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	4.60 %	5.50 %

## IX. Student Performance

### Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including the California Standards Tests (CSTs); the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). The CSTs show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. The CSTs include English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics in grades two through eleven; science in grades five, eight, and nine through eleven; and history-social science in grades eight, and ten through eleven. The CAPA includes ELA, mathematics, and science in grades two through eleven, and for science for grades five, eight, and ten. The CAPA is given to those students with significant cognitive disabilities whose disabilities prevent them from taking either the CSTs with accommodations or modifications or the CMA with accommodations. The CMA includes ELA and mathematics for grades three through eight and science in grade five and is an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards. The CMA is designed to assess those students whose disabilities preclude them from achieving grade-level proficiency on an assessment of the California content standards with or without accommodations. Student scores are reported as performance levels. Detailed information regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, can be found on the CDE [Standardized Testing and Reporting \(STAR\) Results](#) Web site. Program information regarding the STAR Program can be found in the [Explaining 2008 STAR Program Summary Results to the Public](#) guide. Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

### Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the percent of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards).

Subject	School			District			State		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
English-Language Arts	68	77	81	62	65	67	46	50	52
Mathematics	75	82	87	62	65	67	43	46	48
Science	58	77	92	63	65	70	46	50	54
History-Social Science	0	0	0	52	58	62	36	41	44

*Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.*

### Standardized Testing and Reporting Results by Student Group (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays the percent of students, by group, achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most recent testing period.

Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced
-------	---

	English-Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	History-Social Science
African American	*	*		
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian	88	94	*	
Filipino	*	*	*	
Hispanic or Latino	67	77	82	
Pacific Islander	*	*		
White (not Hispanic)	87	92	97	
Male	75	88	93	
Female	86	86	92	
Economically Disadvantaged	60	83	*	
English Learners	*	*		
Students with Disabilities	54	67	*	
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services				

*Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.*

## California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2009-10) – Notice of Delay from the CA Dept. of Education

The California Physical Fitness Test is administered to students in grades five, seven, and nine only.

The purpose of this e-mail is to inform you that the 2009–10 Physical Fitness Test (PFT) results will not be released to local educational agencies (school districts). The PFT contractor, the San Joaquin County Office of Education (SJCOE), is still working to correct errors in the data submitted and to complete the processing of the reports.

We are aware that the 2009–10 PFT data will not be available to you as you prepare your School Accountability Report Cards (SARCs) for upcoming dissemination. Submit your SARC without the 2009–10 PFT data noting in the PFT section, “the PFT data are not available at the time of posting.”

## X. Accountability

### Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found on the CDE [Academic Performance Index \(API\)](#) Web page.

### Academic Performance Index Ranks – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the school's statewide and similar schools API ranks. The statewide API rank ranges from one to ten. A statewide rank of one means that the school has an API score in the lowest ten percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of ten means that the school has an API score in the highest ten percent of all schools in the state. The similar schools API rank reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched "similar schools." A similar schools rank of one means that the school's academic performance is comparable to the lowest performing ten schools of the 100 similar schools, while a similar schools rank of ten means that the school's academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools.

API Rank	2007	2008	2009
Statewide	9	9	9
Similar Schools	8	4	7

**"N/A"**

means a number is not applicable or not available due to missing data.

**"B"**

means this is either an LEA or an Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) school. Schools participating in the ASAM do not currently receive growth, target information, or statewide or similar schools rankings on this report in recognition of their markedly different educational missions and populations served. ASAM schools are covered under the Alternative Accountability system as required by Education Code Section 52052 and not the API accountability system. However, API information is needed to comply with the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. Growth, target and rank information are not applicable to LEAs.

**"C"**

means this is a special education school. Statewide and similar schools ranks are not applicable to special education schools.

**"\*"**

means this API is calculated for a small school or a small LEA, defined as having between 11 and 99 valid STAR Program test scores included in the API. APIs based on small numbers of students are less reliable and therefore should be carefully interpreted. Similar schools ranks are not calculated for small schools.

## Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays, by student group, the actual API changes in points added or lost for the past three years, and the most recent API score. Note: "N/A" means that the student group is not numerically significant.

Group	Actual API Change			Growth API Score
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010
All Students at the School	-17	38	21	923
African American				
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian				
Filipino				
Hispanic or Latino	-45	31	16	860
Pacific Islander				
White (not Hispanic)	2	47	21	924
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged				
English Learners				
Students with Disabilities				

**"N/A"**

means a number is not applicable or not available due to missing data.

**"\*\*"**

means this API is calculated for a small school, defined as having between 11 and 99 valid Standardized Testing and

Reporting (STAR) Program test scores included in the API. The API is asterisked if the school was small either in 2008 or 2009. APIs based on small numbers of students are less reliable and therefore should be carefully interpreted.

## Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal NCLB Act requires that all schools and districts meet the following Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria:

- Participation rate on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- Percent proficient on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- API as an additional indicator
- Graduation rate (for secondary schools)

Detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, can be found on the CDE [Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Web page](#).

## Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays an indication of whether the school and the district made AYP overall and whether the school and the district met each of the AYP criteria.

AYP Criteria	School	District
Overall	Yes	No
Participation Rate - English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes
Participation Rate - Mathematics	Yes	Yes
Percent Proficient - English-Language Arts	Yes	No
Percent Proficient - Mathematics	Yes	No
API	Yes	Yes
Graduation Rate	N/A	Pend

"Yes"

Met 2010 AYP Criteria

"No"

Did not Meet 2010 AYP Criteria

## Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2010-11)

Schools and districts receiving federal Title I funding enter Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (ELA or mathematics) or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, schools and districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP. Detailed information about PI identification can be found on the CDE [Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Web page](#).

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status		Not In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		
Year in Program Improvement		
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	4
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	11.8

## XII. Instructional Planning and Scheduling

### Professional Development

This section provides information on the annual number of school days dedicated to staff development for the most recent three-year period.

Preservice Days in 06/07 = 5 days

Preservice Days in 07/08 = 5 days

Preservice Days in 08/09 = 4 days

Preservice Days in 09/10 = 2 days

In the above years, schools were either on the weekly early release/late start (PLC's) or the (8) district staff development days.

Minimum days are separate.

## XIII. National Assessment of Educational Progress

### National Assessment of Educational Progress

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is a nationally representative assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. Assessments are conducted periodically in mathematics, reading, science, writing, the arts, civics, economics, geography, and U.S. history. Student scores for reading and mathematics are reported as performance levels (i.e., basic, proficient, and advanced) and the participation of students with disabilities and English language learners is reported based on three levels (identified, excluded, and assessed). Detailed information regarding the NAEP results for each grade, performance level, and participation rate can be found on the [National Assessment of Educational Progress](#) Web page (Outside Source).

Note: Only a sample group of California's schools and districts participate in the NAEP testing cycle. Therefore, students in any particular school or district may not be included in these results. The NAEP reflects state test results and is not reflective of either the LEA or the individual school. Comparisons of student performance on the NAEP and student performance on the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program assessments cannot be made without an understanding of the key differences between the two assessment programs. For example, the NAEP only assesses grades four, eight and twelve and for long-term trends assesses grades nine, thirteen, and seventeen. Additionally, the NAEP only provides state test results for grades four and eight. The California Standards Tests (CSTs) are based on a different set of standards than the NAEP assessments. For example, the NAEP is not aligned with California academic content and achievement standards and, therefore, does not necessarily reflect the curriculum and instruction to which students are exposed in the classroom. The NAEP assesses reading and writing separately, while the CSTs assess English-language arts (ELA), encompassing reading as well as writing conventions, spelling, and grammar. Scores on the CSTs and other assessments are not directly comparable to those on NAEP. The averages and percentages presented are estimates based on samples of students rather than on entire populations. Finally, the questions students respond to are only a sample of the knowledge and skills covered by the NAEP frameworks. Information on the differences between NAEP and CST can be found on the CDE [National Assessment of Educational Progress \(NAEP\)](#) Web page.

### National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading and Mathematics Results by Grade Level – Aggregated

This table displays the scale scores and achievement levels on the National Assessment of Educational Progress Results for reading (2007) and mathematics (2009) for grades four and eight

Subject and Grade Level	Average Scale Score		State Percent at Achievement Level		
	State	National	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Reading 2009, Grade 4	210	220	30	18	5
Reading 2009, Grade 8	253	262	41	20	2
Mathematics 2009, Grade 4	232	239	41	25	5
Mathematics 2009, Grade 8	270	282	36	18	5

## National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading and Mathematics Results for Students with Disabilities and/or English Language Learners by Grade Level – A

This table displays the state and national participation rates on the National Assessment of Educational Progress for reading (2007) and mathematics (2009) for students with disabilities and/or English language learners for grades four and eight.

Subject and Grade Level	State Participation Rate		National Participation Rate	
	Students With Disabilities	English Language Learners	Students With Disabilities	English Language Learners
Reading 2009, Grade 4	73	95	71	84
Reading 2009 Grade 8	81	95	72	84
Mathematics 2009, Grade 4	81	95	72	83
Mathematics 2009, Grade 8	85	96	78	92